arXiv:1609.05295v2 [math.AC] 6 Apr 2017

Counter-examples to non-noetherian Elkik's approximation theorem

Kei Nakazato

Abstract

We give counter-examples to the assertion of Elkik's approximation theorem in a non-noetherian case. Our construction is based on Greco and Salmon's example of non-flat completion. This example will be improved to satisfy the smoothness conditions assumed in that theorem.

1 Introduction

This paper deals with an outgrowth of M. Artin's celebrated work [2], Elkik's approximation theorem. We exhibit counter-examples against the assertion of this theorem without finiteness assumptions such as noetherianness. The principal example is described in Example 3.2. To mention our motivation, we recall the following question which plays an important role in Artin's theory (cf. [2, Section 1]).

Question 1.1. *Let (A, I) be a pair consisting of a ring A and its ideal I. Set $\widehat{A}$ to be the I-adic completion of A. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$ be polynomials, and suppose that the equation system*

$$\begin{cases} f_1(X_1, \ldots, X_N) = 0 \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ f_m(X_1, \ldots, X_N) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

has a solution $\overline{\mathbf{a}} = (\overline{a}_1, \ldots, \overline{a}_N) \in \widehat{A}^N$. Let c be a positive integer. Does there exist a solution $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_N) \in A^N$ of (1.1) such that $a_i \equiv \overline{a}_i \mod I^c$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$?

First consider the case where A is noetherian. There we can answer this question affirmatively in various occasions, as follows ([1], [10], [11], [12], [13], and [16]): if (A, I) is henselian and the natural morphism $A \to \widehat{A}$ is regular, Question 1.1 always has an affirmative answer. This statement is a far-reaching generalization of Artin's result ([2, Theorem 1.10]).

Next we discuss the main subject, the case where A is non-noetherian. There Question 1.1 has been studied by several different methods, as treated in [3], [9], and [15]. In Elkik's work [3], under some smoothness assumptions on (1.1) and its solution, she gave the affirmative answers for a quite broad class of henselian rings (*Elkik's approximation theorem*, Theorem 2.5). In this theorem, the condition imposed on a henselian pair (A, I) is weaker than noetherianness. We denote it by $(*)$ (cf. §2.2). When I is principal, $(*)$ is reduced to the condition

($\mathbf{E_a}$) *$I = (t)$, and A has bounded t-torsion (i.e. there exists an integer $l > 0$ such that t^l annihilates any element killed by a power of t in A).*

The fundamental purpose of this paper is to investigate to what extent Elkik's approximation theorem can be applied. As a first step, we verify that it is necessary to assume a finiteness condition such as $(*)$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *If the assumption of $(*)$ is removed, Elkik's approximation theorem* (Theorem 2.5) *does not hold.*

We prove Theorem 1.2 by constructing the basic counter-example where $I = (t)$ but A has unbounded t-torsion (Example 3.2). It confirms the significance of ($\mathbf{E_a}$) in Elkik's approximation theorem. As a variant of this counter-example, we describe another one which shows that $(*)$ cannot be replaced with an extension of ($\mathbf{E_a}$) (Example 3.5).

The key ingredient for this work is Greco and Salmon's example of non-flat I-adic completion (where $I = (t)$). This example also gives a negative answer to Question 1.1 (Example 3.1), but it is not sufficient for our purpose. The reason is that the above smoothness assumptions are not satisfied there. To improve it, we define an auxiliary equation and suitable relations. For every integer $n \geq 1$, the latter relations produce some t-torsion element $\xi_n \in A$ such that $t^n \xi_n \neq 0$ but $t^{n+1}\xi_n = 0$. The relation $t^{n+1}\xi_n = 0$ contributes to solving the new equation system in $\widehat{A}$, and the other $t^n \xi_n \neq 0$ is required to conclude the approximation fails. It is easily seen that after these modifications ($\mathbf{E_a}$) is no longer satisfied.

2 Terminology and preliminaries

Throughout this paper, all rings are assumed to be commutative with unit. Moreover, by a *pair* we mean a datum (A, I) consisting of a ring A and its ideal I. A

morphism of pairs $u : (A, I) \to (B, J)$ means a ring homomorphism $u : A \to B$ such that $u^{-1}(J) = I$. We say that a pair (A, I) is noetherian, if A is so.

2.1 Henselian pairs

Let us first recall some basic notions on *henselian pairs*. There are a number of formulations of the definition of a henselian pair (cf. [7, 2.6.1] or [14, Chapitre XI, §2]). Here we give the one adopted in Elkik's paper [3].

Definition 2.1. A pair (A, I) is said to be *henselian*, if I is contained in the Jacobson radical of A, and for every étale A-algebra A' such that the induced morphism $A/I \to A' \otimes_A A/I$ is an isomorphism, there exists an A-morphism $A' \to A$.

If for a fixed pair (A, I) Question 1.1 has an affirmative answer in any situation, then (A, I) is necessarily henselian ([7, 5.1.2(2)]). However, the converse is not true. In the next section we treat some henselian pairs which provide negative answers for Question 1.1, and their existence is assured by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 ([5, 6.1(i)])**.** *Let (A, I) be a pair. Then, there exists a henselian pair (A^h, I^h) together with a morphism $(A, I) \to (A^h, I^h)$, which has the following universal property*:

- *for any henselian pair (A', I') together with a morphism $(A, I) \to (A', I')$, there exists a unique morphism $(A^h, I^h) \to (A', I')$ such that the resulting diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (A, I) & \to & (A^h, I^h) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & (A', I') \end{array}$$

  commutes.

Such a pair (A^h, I^h) as in Theorem 2.2 is unique up to canonical isomorphisms. The henselian pair (A^h, I^h) is called the *henselization of* (A, I), and the A-algebra A^h is called the *I-adic henselization of A*. We will use the following properties of henselization.

Proposition 2.3 ([5, 6.1(iii)])**.** *Let (A, I) be a pair and (A^h, I^h) the henselization of (A, I). Then $I^h = IA^h$, and the morphism $A \to A^h$ is flat.*

2.2 Elkik's approximation theorem

Let A be a ring, $a \in A$ an element, and M an A-module. An element $x \in M$ is said to be *a-torsion*, if there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that $a^n x = 0$. We denote by $M_{a\text{-tor}}$ the A-submodule consisting of all a-torsion elements in M.

We say that a pair (A, I) satisfies $(*)$, if it satisfies either one of the following conditions:

($\mathbf{E_a}$) *$I = (t)$, and there exists an integer $l > 0$ such that $t^l A_{t\text{-tor}} = (0)$;*

($\mathbf{E_b}$) *there exists a noetherian pair (A_0, I_0) such that A is flat over A_0 and $I = I_0 A$.*

Remark 2.4. When I is principal ($\mathbf{E_b}$) $\Rightarrow$ ($\mathbf{E_a}$), and thus $(*) \Leftrightarrow$ ($\mathbf{E_a}$), as follows. Let (A, I) be a pair which satisfies ($\mathbf{E_b}$) and $I = (t)$. From ($\mathbf{E_b}$), it holds that

$$\mathrm{Ann}_A(t^k) = \mathrm{Ann}_A({I_0}^k A) = (\mathrm{Ann}_{A_0}({I_0}^k))A$$

for all $k \geq 1$ ([8, Theorem 7.4.(iii)]). Meanwhile, since A_0 is noetherian, the ascending chain of ideals $\mathrm{Ann}_{A_0}(I_0) \subset \mathrm{Ann}_{A_0}({I_0}^2) \subset \mathrm{Ann}_{A_0}({I_0}^3) \subset \cdots$ becomes stationary. Hence so does the chain $\mathrm{Ann}_A(t) \subset \mathrm{Ann}_A(t^2) \subset \mathrm{Ann}_A(t^3) \subset \cdots$, and thus (A, I) satisfies ($\mathbf{E_a}$).

Now we state the assertion of Elkik's approximation theorem.

Theorem 2.5 ([3, Théorème 2 *bis* and p.587])**.** *Let (A, I) be a henselian pair, and suppose that (A, I) satisfies $(*)$. Set $\widehat{A}$ to be the I-adic completion of A. Let B be a finitely presented A-algebra, $\overline{B} = B \otimes_A \widehat{A}$, $V \subset \mathrm{Spec}\, B$ an open set smooth over $\mathrm{Spec}\, A$, and $\overline{V} \subset \mathrm{Spec}\, \overline{B}$ the preimage of V.*

Then for every nonnegative integer n and every $\widehat{A}$-section $\overline{\varepsilon} : \mathrm{Spec}\, \widehat{A} \to \mathrm{Spec}\, \overline{B}$ whose restriction to $\mathrm{Spec}\, \widehat{A} \setminus V(I\widehat{A})$ factors through $\overline{V}$, there exists an A-section $\varepsilon : \mathrm{Spec}\, A \to \mathrm{Spec}\, B$ congruent to $\overline{\varepsilon}$ modulo I^n, and whose restriction to $\mathrm{Spec}\, A \setminus V(I)$ factors through V.

3 Counter-examples

Here we describe the principal counter-example to prove Theorem 1.2 (Example 3.2) and its variant which satisfies a mild finiteness condition (Example 3.5). Before that, let us recall a known example of a henselian pair which provides a negative answer for Question 1.1. This example and the principal one are based on the following key fact: *the I-adic henselization of A is always flat over A, but the I-adic completion is not so.*

Example 3.1 ([6, pp.24-25] and [7, pp.137-138])**.** Let k be a field. We consider a polynomial ring in countable many indeterminates $k[x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots][y]$, and its ideal

$$\mathfrak{a} = (x_0y, x_0 - x_1y, x_1 - x_2y, x_2 - x_3y, \ldots) \ .$$

Let us denote the quotient $k[y, x_0, x_1, \ldots]/\mathfrak{a}$ by R. Consider the polynomial ring $R[t]$. Let A be the t-adic henselization of $R[t]$ and $\widehat{A}$ the t-adic completion of A. Then, for the linear equation

$$(t - y)X = 0 \ , \tag{3.1}$$

we can find the solution $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i t^i$ in $\widehat{A}$. However, it is obvious that in $R[t]$ the equation (3.1) cannot be solved. Since A is flat over $R[t]$, A does not have any solution of (3.1), too (this property is not preserved under t-adic completion, and thus $\widehat{A}$ *is not flat over* A). Therefore this example gives a negative answer to Question 1.1.

In this example, $R[t]$ is t-torsion free, and so is A. Hence the bounding condition $(\mathbf{E_a})$ is satisfied, and thus this example does not work well as a counter-example to Theorem 2.5. The cause lies in the $\widehat{A}$-section $\overline{\varepsilon}$ associated with α. More precisely, against the hypothesis in Theorem 2.5, the restriction of $\overline{\varepsilon}$ to $\operatorname{Spec} \widehat{A} \backslash V(t\widehat{A})$ cannot factor through $\overline{V} \subset \operatorname{Spec} \overline{B}$. To overcome this, we add an auxiliary equation to this example. Then we impose suitable relations on $R[t]$ to solve the new equation system only in $\widehat{A}$. These modifications lead us to the principal example. There $(\mathbf{E_a})$ is not satisfied, nor is $(*)$.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Example 3.2. *Let k and R be the same as in Example 3.1. Consider the polynomial ring $R[t]$ and its ideal*

$$\mathfrak{n} = (x_0t^2, x_1t^3, x_2t^4, \ldots) \ .$$

Let A_0 be the quotient $R[t]/\mathfrak{n}$, A the t-adic henselization of A_0, and $\widehat{A}$ the t-adic completion of A. Let B be the finitely presented A-algebra $B = A[X]/(f_1, f_2)$ where

$$\begin{cases} f_1 = (t - y)X \\ f_2 = t^2X \end{cases} \ , \tag{3.2}$$

$\overline{B} = B \otimes_A \widehat{A}$, $V = \operatorname{Spec} B \setminus V(tB)$, and $\overline{\varepsilon} : \operatorname{Spec} \widehat{A} \to \operatorname{Spec} \overline{B}$ the $\widehat{A}$-section determined by the solution $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i t^i \in \widehat{A}$ associated with (3.2). Then this example provides a proof of Theorem 1.2.

Let us verify it. By virtue of the auxiliary polynomial f_2, $V = \operatorname{Spec} B \setminus V(tB)$ is étale over $\operatorname{Spec} A$. Therefore B, V, and $\overline{\varepsilon}$ clearly satisfy the conditions assumed in Theorem 2.5. Thus it suffices to show that any solution of $f_1 = 0$ in A is not congruent to α modulo (t). The flatness of henselization (Proposition 2.3) enables us to make use of the following argument about A_0. Let $\mathfrak{c} \subset A_0$ be the kernel of the A_0-endomorphism

$$A_0 \to A_0,\ \xi \mapsto (t-y)\xi\ .$$

The following claim is essential in our proof.

Claim 1. $\mathfrak{c} \subset tA_0$.

We assume Claim 1 at this moment and observe that Theorem 1.2 follows from this claim. Since A is flat over A_0, an arbitrary solution of $f_1 = 0$ in A belongs to $\mathfrak{c}A$. From Claim 1, it belongs to tA, too. However, $x_0 \notin (t)$, and thus $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i t^i \notin (t)$. Consequently any solution of $f_1 = 0$ in A is not congruent to α modulo (t), and Theorem 1.2 is proved.

Thus it suffices to prove Claim 1. Before giving the proof, we first try to reveal the structures of R and A_0 which seem to be somewhat complicated.

Claim 2. *As a k-vector space, R has the basis $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \cup \{1, y, y^2, \ldots\}$.*

Claim 3. *Regard A_0 as an R-module generated by $\{1, t, t^2, \ldots\}$. Then the annihilator of $t^i \in A_0$ is*

$$\operatorname{Ann}_R(t^i) = \begin{cases} (0) & (i = 1) \\ kx_0 + \cdots + kx_{i-2} & (i \geq 2)\ . \end{cases}$$

Proof of Claim 2. For nonnegative integers i, j, the elements $x_i, x_j \in R$ satisfy

$$x_i x_j = x_{i+j+1} y^{j+1} x_j = 0\ . \tag{3.3}$$

Hence R is generated by $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \cup \{1, y, y^2, \ldots\}$ as a k-vector space.

We show that they are linearly independent. Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer and assume that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} e_{-i-1} y^i + \sum_{i=0}^{n} e_i x_i = 0 \tag{3.4}$$

where $e_i \in k$ $(-n-1 \leq i \leq n)$. Multiplying both sides of (3.4) by x_n, we get $\sum_{i=0}^{n} e_{i-n-1} x_i = 0$. Thus the linear independence follows from the statement

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} e_i x_i = 0 \ \Rightarrow\ e_n = 0\ . \tag{3.5}$$

Let us prove the statement (3.5). Since $y^n(\sum_{i=0}^n e_i x_i) = e_n x_0$, it suffices to check that $x_0 \in k[x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots][y]$ does not belong to $\mathfrak{a}$. This is easy. □

Proof of Claim 3. We put $S = R[t]$. S has a grading $S = \bigoplus_{d\in\mathbb{N}} S_d$, where $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the semigroup of nonnegative integers and $S_d \subset S$ consists of all monomials of degree d.

For an element $a \in R$, $a \in \mathrm{Ann}_R(t^i)$ means that $at^i \in \mathfrak{n} \cap S_i$ in $R[t]$. Thus if $i = 1$, clearly $a = 0$. Suppose that $i \geq 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{n} \cap S_i &= S_{i-2}x_0t^2 + \cdots + S_0 x_{i-2}t^i \\ &= Rx_0t^i + \cdots + Rx_{i-2}t^i \ . \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} a \in \mathrm{Ann}_R(t^i) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad a &\in Rx_0 + \cdots + Rx_{i-2} \\ &= kx_0 + \cdots + kx_{i-2} \ . \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we used (3.3). □

We then start to prove Claim 1.

Proof of Claim 1. Choose an arbitrary element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{c}$. Then there exist an integer $N \geq 2$ and $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_N \in R$ such that $\gamma = \sum_{i=0}^N c_i t^i$ (a way of choosing $\{c_i\}$ is not unique, but it is permissible to choose them arbitrarily). Our goal in this proof is to show that $c_0 = 0$. Multiplying γ by $(t - y)$, we get

$$-c_0 y + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (c_i - c_{i+1}y)t^{i+1} + c_N t^{N+1} = 0 \ . \tag{3.6}$$

Recall that $S = R[t]$ is a graded ring as in the proof of Claim 3. Since $\mathfrak{n} \subset S$ is its homogeneous ideal, the quotient A_0 is also graded by degree of t. Therefore we can decompose (3.6) into the following equations about c_i:

$$c_0 y = 0 \ , \tag{3.7}$$

$$(c_i - c_{i+1}y)t^{i+1} = 0 \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1) \ , \tag{3.8}$$

$$c_N t^{N+1} = 0 \ . \tag{3.9}$$

From Claim 2 and (3.7), it is easily seen that there exists $d_0 \in k$ which satisfies $c_0 = d_0 x_0$. Thus it suffices to verify $d_0 = 0$. Then it is enough to prove that c_N admits the expression

$$c_N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e_j^{(N-1)} x_j + d_0 x_N \ , \tag{3.10}$$

where $e_j^{(N-1)} \in k$ $(j = 0, \ldots, N-1)$. Indeed, by substituting the right-hand side of (3.10) for c_N in (3.9), we first obtain $d_0 x_N t^{N+1} = 0$. Then $d_0 x_N \in kx_0 + \cdots + kx_{N-1}$ from Claim 3. Thus Claim 2 implies $d_0 = 0$.

Now we show (3.10) by induction. Let us start with c_1. From $(i = 0)$-part of (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} & (c_0 - c_1 y)t = 0 \\ \Rightarrow\ & (d_0 x_1 - c_1) yt = 0 \quad (\text{for} \quad c_0 = d_0 x_0) \\ \Rightarrow\ & (d_0 x_1 - c_1) y = 0 \quad (\text{from} \quad \text{Claim 3}) \\ \Rightarrow\ & d_0 x_1 - c_1 \in kx_0 \quad (\text{from} \quad \text{Claim 2}) \ . \end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists $e_0^{(0)} \in k$ such that

$$c_1 = e_0^{(0)} x_0 + d_0 x_1 \ . \tag{3.11}$$

Secondly, we compute c_2 by using (3.11). From $(i = 1)$-part of (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} & (c_1 - c_2 y)t^2 = 0 \\ \Rightarrow\ & (e_0^{(0)} x_1 + d_0 x_2 - c_2) yt^2 = 0 \qquad (\text{from (3.11)}) \\ \Rightarrow\ & (e_0^{(0)} x_1 + d_0 x_2 - c_2) y \in kx_0 \qquad (\text{from Claim 3}) \\ \Rightarrow\ & e_0^{(0)} x_1 + d_0 x_2 - c_2 \in kx_0 + kx_1 \quad (\text{from Claim 2}) \ . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we conclude that there exist $e_0^{(1)}, e_1^{(1)} \in k$ which satisfy

$$c_2 = e_0^{(1)} x_0 + e_1^{(1)} x_1 + d_0 x_2 \ .$$

For every integer $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, the procedure for computing c_{i+1} from the value of c_i is similar to the above. As a consequence, we obtain (3.10). □

Remark 3.3. For integers $n \geq m \geq 2$, we set $f_2^{(n)} \in A[X]$ to be the polynomial $f_2^{(n)} = t^n X$, and $\mathfrak{n}^{(m)} \subset R[t]$ the ideal $\mathfrak{n}^{(m)} = (x_0 t^m, x_1 t^{m+1}, x_2 t^{m+2}, \ldots)$. It is possible to replace $(f_2, \mathfrak{n})$ in Example 3.2 with $(f_2^{(n)}, \mathfrak{n}^{(m)})$. Thus there exist infinitely many counter-examples of this type, and Example 3.2 represents them.

Remark 3.4. Note that the quasi-compact scheme $\operatorname{Spec} A_0 \setminus V((t))$ is noetherian (i.e. A_0 is said to be *noetherian outside* (t), cf. [4]). Thus Example 3.2 shows that the condition $(\mathbf{E_b})$ cannot be extended by the replacement of "noetherian" with "noetherian outside I_0".

3.2 Another example with bounded torsion

Let (A, I) be a pair. We denote by $A_{I\text{-tor}}$ the ideal $\bigcap_{t\in I} A_{t\text{-tor}} \subset A$. Let us consider the following condition which is an extension of $(\mathbf{E_a})$:

$(\mathbf{E_a}')$ *there exists an integer* $l > 0$ *such that* $I^l A_{I\text{-tor}} = (0)$.

By a slight modification on Example 3.2, we can show that $(\mathbf{E_a}')$ is not sufficient for the assertion of Theorem 2.5 to hold. Here we give another counter-example where the henselian pair satisfies $(\mathbf{E_a}')$.

Example 3.5. Let k and R be the same as in Example 3.1. Consider the polynomial ring $R[t, u]$ and its ideals

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{n} = (x_0t^2, x_1t^3, x_2t^4, \ldots) \\ \mathfrak{n}' = (x_0u, x_1tu, x_2t^2u, x_3t^3u, \ldots) \ . \end{cases}$$

Put $A_0' = R[t, u]/(\mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{n}')$ and $I_0 = (t, u) \subset A_0'$. Let A' be the I_0-adic henselization of A_0', $I \subset A'$ the ideal I_0A', and $\widehat{A}'$ the I-adic completion of A'. Put $B' = A'[X]/(f_1, f_2, g)$ where

$$\begin{cases} f_1 = (t - y)X \\ f_2 = t^2X \\ g = uX \end{cases} , \tag{3.12}$$

$\overline{B'} = B' \otimes_{A'} \widehat{A}'$, and $V' = \operatorname{Spec} B' \setminus V(IB')$. Set $\overline{\varepsilon'} : \operatorname{Spec} \widehat{A}' \to \operatorname{Spec} \overline{B'}$ to be the $\widehat{A}'$-section determined by the solution $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i t^i \in \widehat{A}'$ associated with (3.12). Then this example also gives a proof of Theorem 1.2, and we can verify it by the method applied in §3.1. It suffices to show the following statement corresponding to Claim 1:

$$\{\gamma \in A_0' \mid f_1(\gamma) = 0\} \subset I_0 \ . \tag{3.13}$$

To prove (3.13), we define the structure of a graded ring on A_0'. For $(i_1, i_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, set $S_{(i_1,i_2)} = \{at^{i_1}u^{i_2} \in R[t, u] \mid a \in R\}$. Then we have the graded decomposition

$$R[t, u] = \bigoplus_{(i_1,i_2)\in\mathbb{N}^2} S_{(i_1,i_2)} \ .$$

Since the ideal $\mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{n}' \subset R[t, u]$ is homogeneous, the quotient A_0' is also $\mathbb{N}^2$-graded. Moreover, we can verify

$$\operatorname{Ann}_R(t^{i_1}u^{i_2}) = \begin{cases} (0) & (i_1 = 1,\ i_2 = 0) \\ kx_0 + \cdots + kx_{i_1-2} & (i_1 \geq 2,\ i_2 = 0) \\ kx_0 + \cdots + kx_{i_1} & (i_1 \geq 0,\ i_2 \geq 1) \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

in a similar way to Claim 3.

Let $\gamma \in A'_0$ be an element expressed as $\gamma = \sum_{\max\{i_1,i_2\}\leq N} c_{i_1,i_2} t^{i_1} u^{i_2}$, where $N \geq 2$ and $c_{i_1,i_2} \in R$. Put $c'_i = c_{i,0}$. If $f_1(\gamma) = 0$, from the grading of A'_0, we can find the following equations about c'_i :

$$\begin{aligned} &c'_0 y = 0 \ , \\ &(c'_i - c'_{i+1} y) t^{i+1} = 0 \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1) \ , \\ &c'_N t^{N+1} = 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Then by the latter argument in the proof of Claim 1, we obtain $c'_0 = 0$, and thus $\gamma \in I_0$.

Lastly, let us check that (A', I) satisfies $(\mathbf{E_a}')$. From the grading of A'_0 and (3.14),

$$(A'_0)_{I_0\text{-tor}} = (A'_0)_{t\text{-tor}} \cap (A'_0)_{u\text{-tor}} = (x_0, x_1 t, x_2 t^2, \ldots) \ .$$

Hence $I_0^2 (A'_0)_{I_0\text{-tor}} = 0$. Here A' is flat over A'_0, and therefore we can apply the method used in Remark 2.4. Thus we obtain $I^2 A'_{I\text{-tor}} = 0$, as desired.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Kazuhiro Fujiwara for helpful discussions and careful advice.

References

[1] M. André, *Cinq exposés sur la désingularisation*, Handwritten manuscript, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 1991.

[2] M. Artin, Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **36** (1969), 23-58.

[3] R. Elkik, Solutions d'équations à coefficients dans un anneau hensélien, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* **6** (1973), 553-603.

[4] K. Fujiwara, O. Gabber, and F. Kato, On Hausdorff completions of commutative rings in rigid geometry, *J. Algebra* **332** (2011), 293-321.

[5] S. Greco, Henselization of a ring with respect to an ideal, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **144** (1969), 43-65.

[6] S. Greco and P. Salmon, *Topics in* $\mathfrak{m}$*-adic topologies*, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (2) **58**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.

[7] H. Kurke, G. Pfister, and M. Roczen, *Henselsche Ringe und Algebraische Geometrie*, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1975.

[8] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Ring Theory*, Translated by M. Reid, Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. **8**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[9] L. Moret-Bailly, An extension of Greenberg's theorem to general valuation rings, *Manuscripta Math.* **139** (2012), 153-166.

[10] T. Ogoma, General Néron desingularization based on the idea of Popescu, *J. Algebra* **167** (1994), 57-84.

[11] D. Popescu, General Néron desingularization, *Nagoya Math. J.* **100** (1985), 97-126.

[12] D. Popescu, General Néron desingularization and approximation, *Nagoya Math. J.* **104** (1986), 85-115.

[13] D. Popescu, Letter to the editor: "General Néron desingularization and approximation", *Nagoya Math. J.* **118** (1990), 45-53.

[14] M. Raynaud, *Anneaux locaux henséliens*, Lecture Notes in Math. **169**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.

[15] H. Schoutens, Approximation properties for some non-Noetherian local rings, *Pacific J. Math.* **131** (1988), 331-359.

[16] R. Swan, Néron-Popescu desingularization, *Proceedings of the International Conference of Algebra and Geometry (Taipei, 1995)*, International Press, Cambridge (1998), 135-192.

(Kei Nakazato)
Graduate School of Mathematics
Nagoya University
Nagoya 464-8602, Japan
E-mail: m11047c@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp